APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/772,344	01/29/2001	Richard Zodnik	155681-0007	2389

7590 11/03/2004	EXAMINER
Ben J. Yorks	HOFFMAN, BRANDON S
IRELL & MANELLA, LLP	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2136	

Suite 400
840 Newport Center Drive
Newport Beach, CA 92660

DATE MAILED: 11/03/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/772,344	ZODNIK, RICHARD
	Examiner	**Art Unit**	
	Brandon Hoffman	2136	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-71* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-71* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *29 January 2001* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2.   Claims 46, 61, 70, and 71 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being

anticipated by Alaimo et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,614,811).

Regarding claim 46, Alaimo et al. teaches a system, comprising:

- A backplane that is coupled to a server and has a unique backplane identification

  (fig. 3, ref. num 34 and 36); and

- A computer that can be coupled into said backplane (fig. 3, ref. num 38-48);

- A server that is coupled to said backplane and can transmit evacuation

  information to said computer, said evacuation information being correlated with

  the backplane identification (col. 7, line 65 through col. 8, line 5).

Regarding claim 61, Alaimo et al. teaches a method for operating a computer

system, comprising:

- Plugging a computer into a backplane that has a backplane identification (fig. 3, ref. num 36-48 and fig. 4, ref. num 68);

- Transmitting a client identification from the computer to a server (col. 7, lines 25-32); and

- Correlating the client identification with the backplane identification (col. 9, lines 1-11 and fig. 16).

Regarding claim 70, Alaimo et al. teaches a backplane that can be coupled to a computer and a network, comprising:

- A printed circuit board (it is inherent that a backplane contains a printed circuit board);

- A first network connector that can be coupled to the computer (fig. 3, ref. num 38-48);

- A second network connector that can be coupled to the network (fig. 3, ref. num 36); and

- An integrated circuit that is attached to said printed circuit board and contains a backplane identification (fig. 4, ref. num 68).

Regarding claim 71, Alaimo et al. teaches further comprising a power supply connector that attaches to said printed circuit board (fig. 3, ref. num 50).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4.   Claims 1, 13, 20, 27, 32, 43, 54, 56, 59, 64, and 67 are rejected under 35 U.S.C.

103(a) as being unpatentable over Alaimo et al. (USPN '811) in view of Brozowski et al.

(U.S. Patent No. 6,769,068).

Regarding claims 1 and 13, Alaimo et al. teaches a system, comprising:

- A server (fig. 3, ref. num 36);

- A backplane that is coupled to said server and which contains a unique

  backplane identification (fig. 3, ref. num 34 and fig. 4, ref. num 68); and

- A computer that can be plugged into said backplane and retrieve the backplane

  identification (fig. 3, ref. num 38-48),

  o Said computer compares the backplane identification with a stored

     backplane identification stored in said computer (col. 9, lines 1-11).

Alaimo et al. is silent about the steps taken if the backplane identification does

not match the stored backplane identification.

Brozowski et al. teaches transmitting a command to said server if the backplane

identification does not match the stored backplane identification (fig. 3).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the

invention was made, to combine transmitting a command to the server if the backplane

ID does not match the stored backplane ID, as taught by Brozowski et al., with the

system of Alaimo et al. It would have been obvious for such modifications because this

process authenticates a client to the server.

Regarding claim 56, Alaimo et al. teaches a method for operating a computer

system, comprising:

- Plugging a computer into a backplane (fig. 3, ref. num 38-48 connected to 34);

- Transmitting a backplane identification from the backplane to the computer (fig.

  4, ref. num 68 to 76); and

- Comparing the backplane identification with a stored backplane identification

  (col. 9, lines 1-11).

Alaimo et al. does not teach transmits a command to a network if the backplane

identification does not match the stored backplane identification.

Brozowski et al. teaches transmits a command to the network if the backplane

identification does not match the stored backplane identification (fig. 3).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to combine transmitting a command to the server if the backplane ID does not match the stored backplane ID, as taught by Brozowski et al., with the method of Alaimo et al. It would have been obvious for such modifications because this process authenticates a client to the server.

Regarding claim 67, Alaimo et al. teaches a computer system that can be plugged into a backplane which is coupled to network, wherein the backplane has a unique identification, comprising: a memory device that contains a stored backplane identification number; and a processor that reads the backplane identification from the backplane, compares the backplane identification with the stored backplane identification (col. 8, line 58 through col. 9, line 11).

Alaimo et al. does not teach transmits a command to the network if the backplane identification does not match the stored backplane identification.

Brozowski et al. teaches transmits a command to the network if the backplane identification does not match the stored backplane identification (fig. 3).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to combine transmitting a command to the server if the backplane ID does not match the stored backplane ID, as taught by Brozowski et al., with the

system of Alaimo et al. It would have been obvious for such modifications because this

process authenticates a client to the server.

Regarding claims 20, 27, 32, 43, 54, 59, and 64, the combination of Alaimo et al.

in view of Brozowski et al. teaches wherein said server compares the client identification

with an authorized client identification and inhibits operation of said computer if the

client identification does not match the authorized client identification (see fig. 3 of

Brozowski et al.).

Claims 2-12, 14-19, 21-26, 28-31, 33-42, 44, 45, 47-53, 55, 57, 58, 60, 62, 63,

65, 66, 68, and 69 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Alaimo et al. (USPN '811) in view of Johnson (U.S. Patent No. 6,788,980).

Regarding claims 23 and 30, Alaimo et al. teaches a system, comprising:

- A server that has a relational database that correlates a telephone number to a

  backplane address (col. 6, lines 56-61 and fig. 15);

- A backplane that is coupled to said server and contains a unique backplane

  identification (fig. 3, ref. num 34 and fig. 4, ref. num 68); and

- A computer that can be coupled into said backplane (fig. 3, ref. num 38-48),

  - Said computer has a client identification and a telephone number (col. 7,

    lines 25-32),

o Said computer transmits the client identification to said server so that the

telephone number is correlated with the backplane identification (col. 9,

lines 1-11 and fig. 16).

Alaimo et al. does not teach a computer network address.

Johnson teaches a computer network address (col. 10, lines 32-41).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the

invention was made, to combine a computer network address, as taught by Johnson,

with the system of Alaimo et al. It would have been obvious for such modifications

because a correlated network address ensures that no two devices have the same

address.

Regarding claims 35 and 66, Alaimo et al. teaches a system/method for

operating a computer system, comprising:

- A backplane (fig. 3, ref. num 34);

- A computer that can be coupled into said backplane (fig. 3, ref. num 38-48); and

- An alarm that is coupled to said receiver and is activated in response to the RF id

  (col. 15, lines 35-46).

Alaimo et al. does not teach said computer wirelessly emits a RF id when decoupled from said backplane and a receiver that receives the RF id.

Johnson teaches said computer wirelessly emits a RF id when decoupled from said backplane and a receiver that receives the RF id (col. 6, lines 4-7).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to combine wirelessly emitting an RF id when decoupled from said backplane and a receiver that receives the RF id, as taught by Johnson, with the system/method of Alaimo et al. It would have been obvious for such modifications because wireless transmissions enable portable devices to be easily connected to networks.

Regarding claims 2, 4, 14, 16, 26, 37, 39, 48, 50, 57, 58, 62, and 63, the combination of Alaimo et al. in view of Johnson teaches wherein said server includes a relational database that correlates said backplane with a [network address/telephone number] of said computer (col. 6, lines 56-61 and fig. 15) and the command re-configures the relational database to route information associated with the [network address/telephone number] to said computer (see col. 9, lines 1-11 and fig. 16 of Alaimo et al.).

Regarding claims 3, 15, 24, 38, and 49, the combination of Alaimo et al. in view

of Johnson teaches wherein the network address is an Internet address (see col. 2,

lines 15-27 of Johnson).

Regarding claims 5, 17, 40, and 51, the combination of Alaimo et al. in view of

Johnson teaches wherein the backplane identification is encrypted (see col. 11, lines

26-37 of Johnson).

Regarding claim 6, the combination of Alaimo et al. in view of Johnson teaches

further comprising a mechanical lock that secures said computer to said backplane (see

fig. 2, ref. num 52 of Alaimo et al.).

Regarding claims 7 and 8, the Examiner believes it to be inherent that a monitor

and keyboard are coupled to said backplane.

Regarding claim 9, the combination of Alaimo et al. in view of Johnson teaches

wherein said backplane includes an input/output interface that is coupled to a plurality of

input/output ports, said input/output ports each provide a communication path for

information transmitted in an accordance with a different protocol (see col. 7, lines 1-8

of Alaimo et al.).

Regarding claim 10, the combination of Alaimo et al. in view of Johnson teaches

wherein said computer communicates with said input/output interface to determine said

input/output ports (see col. 7, lines 9-18 of Alaimo et al.).

Regarding claims 11, 18, 41, and 52, the combination of Alaimo et al. in view of

Johnson teaches wherein the command includes a client identification (see col. 7, lines

25-32 of Alaimo et al.).

Regarding claims 12, 19, 25, 31, 42, 53, 68, and 69, the Examiner takes Official

Notice that the computer includes a hard disk drive and a client identification is stored

within at least one hidden sector of said hard disk drive.

It would have been obvious to include a hard disk drive and place the client

identification within a hidden sector of said drive because a hard disk drive is common

to computers, and can hold large volumes of data. By placing the client identification in

a hidden sector, an average user cannot (mistakenly or purposefully) alter or delete the

identification to cause undesired results.

Regarding claims 21, 28, and 55, the combination of Alaimo et al. in view of

Johnson teaches wherein said server generates an alarm in response to receiving an

RF id from said computer (see col. 15, lines 35-46 of Alaimo et al.).

Regarding claims 22, 29, 34, and 45, the combination of Alaimo et al. in view of

Johnson teaches wherein said server transmits an evacuation plan to said computer

when said computer is coupled into said backplane (see col. 7, line 65 through col. 8,

line 5 of Alaimo et al.).

Regarding claims 33 and 44, the combination of Alaimo et al. in view of Johnson

teaches wherein said server generates an alarm if the client identification does not

match the authorized client identification (see col. 15, lines 35-46 of Alaimo et al.).

Regarding claims 36 and 47, the combination of Alaimo et al. in view of Johnson

teaches wherein said backplane contains a unique backplane identification, said

computer compares the backplane identification with a stored backplane identification

stored in said computer, and transmits a command to said server if backplane

identification does not match the stored backplane identification (see fig. 3, ref. num 34-

48 and fig. 4, ref. num 68 and col. 9, lines 1-11 of Alaimo et al.).

Regarding claims 60 and 65, the combination of Alaimo et al. in view of Johnson

teaches further comprising activating an alarm if the client identification does not match

the authorized client identification (see col. 15, lines 35-46 of Alaimo et al.).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brandon Hoffman whose telephone number is 571-272-3863. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30 - 5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz Sheikh can be reached on 571-272-3795. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

BH

AYAZ SHEIKH
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100